DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 067 JC 740 018

AUTHOR Scheufler, John H.
TITLE A Middle Management Position in Post Secondary Education.
PUB DATE 26 Oct 73
NOTE 49p.; Presented at the meeting of the Colorado Association of Deans, October 26, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Administrator Selection; Community Colleges; *Department Directors (School); Departments; Educational Administration; Management; Post Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Middle Management

ABSTRACT

The middle management position of departmental chairman is the point in the organizational structure of the educational institution where good supervision, management and administration must begin. A lack of understanding of the importance of the chairman's role has led to a neglect of the position in the administrative organization and a subsequent weakening of the meanagment structure of the institution. There are four principal areas at the middle management level that, if carefully evaluated and organized, could reduce management problems considerably: (1) the administration of middle management personnel--the neglect of the upper echelon administration to recognize fully the importance of the chairman's position; (2) the selection of middle management personnel; (3) the role difinition of a middle manager, the departmental chairman; and (4) the training of a middle manager, the departmental chairman. The most critical, most needed position within middle management of post-secondary education is that of departmental chairman or its equivalent. The duties and responsibilities of a department chairman are listed, grouped under the following topics: managerially oriented, faculty oriented, curriculum oriented, clerically oriented, student oriented, and maintenance or support personnel oriented. A description of division chairman responsibilities at Golden West College is appended, as is a 46-item bibliography. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085067

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COLORADO ASSOCIATION OF DEANS

MEETING

OCTOBER 26, 1973

A MIDDLE MANAGEMENT POSITION IN POST SECONDARY EDUCATION

JC 740 018

BY

JOHN H. SCHEUFLER

ASSISTANT TO THE DEAN OF INSTRUCTION

EL PASO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
SOME MAJOR FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR MORE SUCCESSFUL MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	7
Middle Management Administration	7
Middle Management Selection	14
Middle Management Role Definition	20
Duties and Responsibilities of our Middle Manager	22
Middle Management Training	29
SUMMARY	34
APPENDIX "A"	37
Division Chairman Responsibilities	37
Teaching	37
Committees and Meetings	37
Advisement	38
Personnel and Instruction	38
Community Relations	40
Co-Curricular Activities	41
Campus Communication	41
Budget	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	43

TABLES

Subject	Page
TABLE I	24

INTRODUCTION

The Nature and Scope of the Problem

The entity in an organizational structure referred to as a "department" has existed in education for some 100 plus years. While it is true that almost all organizational units require or demand some form of sound leadership, there has been, at best, minimal leadership in most departments in education from the secondary school through the graduate school. Literally, tens and even hundreds of articles, papers, reports, and other documents, almost all by people in education, have been written about the department, its leader or chairman, and the failure of the chairman to respond appropriately to the position. Some writers picture the chairman as the benevolent supplier of all faculty needs, minimizing his supervisory and/or leadership roles. Others have shown him to be the autocratic dictator of a strong central administration. Still others find the chairman a weak-kneed, wishey-washey, "Praying Mantis" who can neither lead nor be led, solve a problem, walk the fence between "Management" and "Labor", or forgive or forget. Amazingly, the same people who view the Jekel-Hyde chairman as pictured above, are those who voted, chose, appointed, or elected him to the position----to either further each of their respective needs, or actually thought he could perform the many and varied duties of a "more-or-less" responsible position. A position abounding with activity.

The predominate activity of an educational institution takes place at the level of instruction. Generally, the immediate supervisor at this level is the department chairman or his equivalent. Obviously, this is the largest and most active interface of operations within an institution above the student-

faculty level. The first and perhaps the broadest and most significant level of aggregation takes place here. This fact provides the key spot where good supervision, management and administration must begin. If it begins at any higher level the management structure has lost its underpinnings. For example, department budgets include a range of monies from several thousands of dollars to as much as several million dollars. Administering these amounts of monies requires that it be done carefully and with a degree of expertise heretofore unknown in most departments at any educational level. In fact, there is some question as to appropriate management of these amounts of money at the institution-wide level--the Vice President of Business and Finance notwithstanding.

Any organizational structure is but a convenient method by which separate organizational units and their leaders can be placed in individual slots to fit the hierarchical scheme. (This is not to say that the structure of an organization is not important.) Their names, per se, i.e., department, division, platoon, squad, company or corporation, and the respective leaders of each, i.e., chairman, director, lieutenant, sergeant, captain, supervisor, foreman or president are only convenient symbols and have little significance when viewing the outputs of each unit. The old cliche, "You may call me anything you want as long as you pay me enough and don't call me late for dinner", contains more truth than fiction. Many institutions go to great lengths to avoid using the terms department, division, or chairman. Colleges have devised circles, cones, spheres, squares, rectangles and many other organizational formats to show that "their" organizational structure is different from all others. While there is validity in some of these methods,

there is still a necessity to have organizational units with supervisory personnel that have responsibility and authority. The individual behavior, the organizational behavior and development, and the size of the organizational unit are far more significant and important criteria to focus attention upon than the name of the unit and the name of its leader. Call a "spade" a "spade" and get on with the important aspect of defining roles more precisely, solving attitudinal problems, and promoting group participation within the unit as well as within the total structural framework.

Organizational units having as few as four faculty members, plus a leader, are at or near the point of needing a full-time middle manager. Full time, with a staff of four, some part-time faculty, and a secretary, should allow the teaching of not more than one course during the summer as part of his regular annual salary. This gives increased supervisory time during the regular academic year as well as the summer, provides adequate time for other administrative duties (TABLE I), provides continued classroom experiences, keeps costs relatively down through a more efficient operation, produces uninterrupted management, fosters the smooth, orderly flow of necessary work loads throughout the year, and allows annual training for mid-management personnel. Not placing the chairman on a full-time basis produces the current crisis we now have in our educational system. Some administrators say they lack sufficient funds to place their department chairman on full time. This statement is, obviously, penny-wise and pound-foolish because they fail to take advantage of the tremendous importance of their first-line administrator. Others say, "What would they (the department chairmen) do with all the "free" time?" Obviously, another statement geared to the lack of understanding of

the importance of the position. These statements only serve to point out the need for education of the upper echelon administration, particularly at the level of director, dean, V.P. of Instruction, Provost, and President.

It is impossible for any one, two, or three people to run an institution effectively and efficiently, even if there is only a few hundred students. Administrators who harbor this type of attitude are only putting off until tomorrow what they should have done today. They are walking alone, in the dark, head in the sand, waiting for fate to strike or hoping their prayers will fall upon receptive ecclesiastical ears. The turn over of senior administrative officers in the colleges and universities of the United States, over the past five to ten years, certainly belies the position of a few people trying to run everything. It is imperative, therefore, that not only should universities and colleges produce well-founded and experienced educational managers, but courses must be provided to boards of trustees and directors such that they too will have sufficient educational knowledge upon which they may base their decisions, as they continue their efforts to become effective board members.

History has shown the dire consequences of our past deeds. It, therefore, serves no useful purpose to go into any detail about the chain of events that entrapped us in the present middle management dilemma in education. The bibliography at the end of this paper is adequate to achieve this goal. Hopefully someone will be interested.

Suffice it to say, however, poor administration and management, poor personnel selection, poor role definition, and poor training combined with an

entrenched individual go-it-alone, do-your-own-thing attitude; coupled with a historically undirected chain of events, which were discipline oriented, "guided" us to our present-day problem. Bailey (9, p. 153) put it more succinctly.

> By and large, higher education has been slow to innovate, slow to discard the obsolete. By and large, it is woefully sloppy on matters of rudimentary management. All too many faculties are dog-in-the-mangerish about academic housekeeping. The consequence is utilized and unutilized facilities that would have bankrupted profit-oriented institutions decades ago. Our personnel systems tend to be shoddy. We resist systematic evaluation by peers, students, alumni, or administrators and thereby are thrown into a jungle of unsystematic evaluations by the very same groups. The red herring of academic freedom is drawn across the path of systematic evaluation of performance. Basically the motivation is not the defense of academic freedom at all, but fear of the insecure that their shortcomings might be verified or their sloth exposed.

What is even more difficult to take is that adequate research and writing over the last five years has defined the problems of the middle management departmental area. The titles alone testify to the grossness of the problem, i.e., "The Confidence Crisis" (3), "Blind Man on a Freeway" (5), "Return to Responsibility" (2), "The Departmental Chairman and the Public Institution or It's a Bird, It's a Plane, No it's a ....." (29), "The Chairman: Where Does He Fit In" (10), "Help Stamp Out Department Chairman" (21), "Departmental Operations: The Confidence Game" (16), "Who Decides Who Decides" (18), "Department Chairman: Neither Fish Nor Fowl" (41), "Departmentalization: Solution or Problem" (45), and a whole host of others too numerous to mention. Despite this five year productive literary pace, the surface has hardly been scratched from the stand point of implementing the recommended procedures and methods so adequately presented.

In view of the foregoing, what can be done to cure this ubiquitous and chaotic state of affairs?

Be patient, all is not lost. The very nature of the higher education community toward objective research has laid the foundation for improvement. The vast research previously mentioned, sets the stage for an excellent point of departure.

The major purpose of this paper, then, is to extrapolate from my own experiences, the experiences of others, and from the literature what appears to be some steps to take in order to resolve the issues confronting the single most important middle management position-----the departmental chairman or his equivalent.

SOME MAJOR FACTORS TO CONSIDER FOR MORE SUCCESSFUL MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

There are four principle areas at the middle management level that if carefully evaluated and organized, could reduce management problems drastically. These are, 1) the administration of middle management personnel; 2) the selection of middle management personnel; 3) the role definition of a middle manager-----the departmental chairman; and 4) the training of a middle manager-----the departmental chairman. These four areas are discussed independently and specifically deal with the department chairman or his equivalent. However, the enclosed information would also be applicable to any similar position within the higher education community not necessarily in the academic-vocational areas.

Middle Management Administration

Probably the most significant problem facing the department chairman stems from the failure of his superiors rather than through any fault of his own. This is the neglect of the upper echelon administration to recognize fully the importance of the chairman's position. What was good enough for the central administration when they were department chairman, is certainly good enough for the department chairman now. This points up many other administrative problems explicit within this attitude. For example, 1) the dyed-in-the-wool, don't upset-the-applecart syndrome; 2) the neglect of the senior administrators to constantly seek new and better methods of managerial effectiveness; 3) the lack of fostering among all of their personnel the realization that they are spending public funds; 4) the failure

of the administration to make detailed investigations of the abilities and qualities of the personnel they hire to fill their middle management vacancies; and 5) most important of all, the failure of central administration to recognize the large volume of time-consuming interchange that takes place, or should take place, between the faculty and the chairman, and between the students and the chairman. TABLE I and APPENDIX "A" are examples of the many and varied duties and responsibilities of the department chairman.

Another misdeed of the people to whom the department chairman report is the idea that they are the one and only boss and must give all direction and supervision down to the last detail-----these "leaders" view themselves as completely indispensable and need frequent reminding of this. They are a one-man operation without the slightest hint that delegation of responsibility and authority is a major factor in successful management. The director, dean or provost must hold all power, be omnipotent, and never let any of it escape to the lowly half-teacher, half-administrator. Generally, knowingly or unknowingly, this attitude is the result of having chosen incompetant chairman, fear of their own position, or they may actually feel that their autocratic approach is the "only way to fly." Experience has shown the first two to be more the reason for this attitude rather than the third one. However, running a close second is a combination of the three. Regardless of the reason, this inappropriate, negative attitude serves only to foster poor management and to widen the breech between central administration and the all-important departmental operations.

Still another major administrative factor affecting the performance of the department chairman, is the lack of recognition that the chairman may

have some excellent ideas, and should be included in the administrative sphere. Since the chairman supposedly is in constant contact with the largest segment of "qualified" personnel within the institution, the faculty, the effective chairman should abound with ideas, suggestions, constructive criticism, and many other forms of information. The dedicated, perceptive, and understanding leader would recognize this immediately and utilize whatever ideas were compatible with the situation and give appropriate recognition for them. Therefore, the dean, and other upper echelon administrators must judiciously seek and include the chairman in all planning and management functions. Make him feel wanted and needed, and delegate to him in writing those areas of responsibility and authority best suited to carrying out his administrative task. With well qualified department chairman, delegation of responsibility and authority can be such that the dean's time is freed for the more all encompassing institutional problems. Unfortunately, this is all too often not the case. Dressel's (3, p. 63) survey of the department in higher education, "The Confidence Crisis", presents this,

> .....items clearly indicate that when deans are perceived as influential, decision-making responsibilities within the respective departments are perceived as undelegated." Further he states, "a fuller sharing of university data with departments and adaptation of those data to departmental concerns and needs might materially improve the total situation. Deans tend to object to wide sharing in the fear that budgetary, and particularly salary, differentials will result in difficult confrontations. The answer seems obvious. If inequities exist among departments, they should be brought to light and remedied. If differences exist for a reason, the reason should be stated and defended. Open communications will generate problems, but it will also allay suspicion, and assist in clarifying what the real issues are. (3, p. 13).

Bill Moore, Jr. (5, p. 108) in his book, "Blind Man on a Freeway", put it this way.

> He (the college administrator) MUST (emphasis added) insist, for example, that mid-management personnel (division/department chairman) assume responsibility for the decisions which should be made at their levels, especially the dirty and unpleasant ones which they usually attempt to aviod.

An additional important aspect of administrative neglect toward the department chairman is found in the devious methods used to by-pass him. Many senior administrators encourage the faculty and students alike to come directly to them to solve their ever increasing number of problems. Some administrators do this without knowing the pitfalls which they are entering. Obviously, they could use a basic course in principles of personnel management. Nevertheless, with the increase in faculty-student-department chairman militancy, much of which is justified, there is a greater and more imminent need for appropriate departmental chairman who must be allowed to work out most of the problems at the lowest supervisory level, they must be accountable. Continued lack of understanding of this basic management principle will only succeed in pouring more salt in an already gapping wound.

A final important observation, but by no means the end, to which upper level administrators have not responded very well, is in the area of human and organizational behavior. While education, I feel, has led industry in this field of endeavor for some time, they are by no means "lilly white". In fact, in the last couple of years, industry has made significant gains and has now probably passed education in this newest, and in most respects

the oldest, field of human relations.

Bernthal (11) has shown that modernization requires thinking people and therefore emotions must be treated. Decentralization, which requires delegation of authority and responsibility, provides more decision-making at the lower levels, develops more competence, has more input, improves morale, produces self-motivation, and increases self control. Horizontal job enrichment takes place by the job being made more meaningful and rewarding. Vertical enrichment is gained through better working relations with the supervisor. In turn, the supervisor becomes more authentic and supportive. The modern leader must be flexible, adaptable, and be able to get along. Employee relations become primary and public relations must be emphasized. These observations by Bernthal, hit at the heart of this particular central administrative problem. Effervescent, radiant charisma alone, exuded by directors, deans, provosts, etc. can win half the battle with the department chairman, if followed up with honest inclusion of the middle manager into the entire operation. People are ready, willing, able, and there for the asking if they feel they are part of the operation. However, don't include them, and the gulf between the dean, et al and them can be measured only in light years.

It is obvious from the foregoing that great strides can be made by upper echelon administrators toward negating their many problems by simply including their most important junior administrator within their sphere of operation. While many administrators in education may have 100 or more reasons for not including their important middle manager within the administrative operations, my experience has shown these attitudes can usually be

traced to one or more, or a variation of those attitudes, as presented above (22). Lack of training, secrecy, fear, ineptitude, autocraticness, and lack of understanding of human and organizational behavior problems have led to our unnecessary dilemma.

What then can be done to alleviate these problems so rampant in higher education?

Following is a list of specific suggestions and recommendations which can be implemented to reduce, considerably, I feel, the management problems existing at the departmental level.

1. Allow sufficient annual release time for all administrators to upgrade their managerial skills to be compatible with modern thinking, research, and application. Certainly, some institutions are making great strides in this area. Presidents Bob Lahti of William Rainey Harper and Al Philips of Tulsa Community College set aside definite time segments each year for upgrading their management team (personal communications).

2. Include the department chairman, by both action and definition within the total managerial structure of operation. Give him authority and responsibility, and an equitable time within which to perform. If he does not perform within the alloted time, and he has had continuous assistance and help, then he must be replaced.

3. If the department chairman supervises more than four full-time equivalent professional personnel, some part-time instructors and at least

one support person, he should be considered for year-around employment and perhaps teaching a maximum of one course per year in the summer as part of his annual salary. Teaching one course per year could be reduced to alternate years or eliminated altogether if the size of the department reaches 10-12 FTE professional personnel. At any rate, the maximum number of professional personnel in one department under the supervision of one person probably should not exceed 20-25 FTE.

4. A detailed study should be made of the exact nature of all departments or organizational units within an institution to establish equitable standards of salary, promotion and working conditions, departmental differences, the nature of the problems affecting each, and a detailed review of policies and procedures affecting, particularly, the organizational structure, chain of command, job descriptions, and inter- and intra-unit operations.

5. Attempts must be made to "expose" or "ferret-out" the dictatorial person-----not publicly or individually, but in a manner which will bring change to this individual artist such that he can see for himself the vast benefits of another way of life. Total organizational behavior will not condone the luxury of a separate kingdom. If this cannot be accomplished through consultation, behavioral schooling, sound management practices, and even very gentle "coercive-type" encouragement, then a change must be made. Certainly, ultimate institutional goals and objectives, and organizational development hold sway over the sum of the individual parts. If nothing else, the expenditure of public funds alone dictates managerial effectiveness.

6. Every effort must be made to educate all personnel, particularly the administrators, to the role individual and organizational behavior play in the important overall aspect of organizational development. Courses should be given, on campus if possible, by experts in the field with mandatory attendance required for any and all supervisory personnel. While this procedure may sound a little dictatorial at first, particularly for we in education, the results could prove to be the "making or "breaking" of an institution. I am sure, that as members of the educational community read this article, they could think without any hesitation, of two or three institutions in their immediate vicinity which are in dire need of just such courses and administrative personnel to apply them.

These suggestions and recommendations are not presented as a panacea to the deparmtent chairman's many woes, and I am sure I am not the first to mention them; however, judicial endeavors to correct the administrative perception of the department chairman as herein presented, is the largest single step that can be taken to correct a serious problem which has long been neglected.

Some other areas affecting the department chairman are equally as important and again reflect on the senior administrators efforts. One of these is the selection of his chairman.

Middle Management Selection

The selection of middle management personnel varies considerably with each particular position and institution. Further, certain criteria are common to all positions and need little elaboration. More important to the

problem at hand, however, are the often overlooked essential items which make for the selection of more successful managers. Not that successful managers can easily be defined or readily found by looking for a person who seems to fit a preconceived idea of a position or a list of particular criteria. Positions should not be created for people, because the function of a position is independent of the person occupying it. That is, jobs are created because of their need, not because a particular person needs a job, needs or wants a different job, or a raise in salary. While some "family" operations still may function under this peculiar and sometimes necessary arrangement, public corporations, and more specifically the public sector at large (local, state, and federal government, including education) cannot; and, in most cases would be breaking the law if they did.

This discussion, therefore, will be directed toward selection of the department chairman or his equivalent and those criteria which appear to be frequently, but not always overlooked, but which seem to me to be essential to selection or the process of selection.

Tony Mobley (30, p. 321) writing in the Fall 1971 issue of the "Educational Record" stated the following:

> The Department Chairman fills one of the most important positions in the administrative structure of the college or university. Since the chairman holds line responsibility, he or she is the pivot or middleman at the point where administration most directly contacts the faculty. The chairman is the key to the success or failure of the departmental program.
>
> One authority (44, p. 77) suggests that at least 80 percent of all administrative decisions take place at the departmental rather than a higher administrative level. It is in.....departments

> that policy and general administrative decisions must be defined, adopted, or applied. The chairman interprets institutional policies to the faculty, implements them in the department, and interprets departmental objectives and programs to the administration. .....the department chairman is the all-important link between faculty and administration as he represents each to the other. It is of paramount importance that this position be filled with a man of great scholastic and administrative statesmanship, and that he be selected with great care.

Dr. Mobley reflects the feeling of many administrators, including myself. The last statement, ".....he be selected with great care." is probably the most valid but unused procedure in all of education. Nothing is more important at anytime than to insure careful, detailed selection of personnel. Unfortunately, the careful selection of personnel in education has received little attention in the past. Fortunately, now that the Affirmative Action Plan has finally arrived on the scene, a much greater emphasis is being placed upon the details of selecting personnel. Also, fortunately, sex, race, ethnic background, religion or any other pertinent category affecting free, open application and selection of candidates is being drastically deemphasized.

Mobley (29, p. 326) has suggested five general but basic principles which should be used when selecting a department chairman. These are as follows:

1. There must be <u>formalized</u> and <u>meaningful</u> faculty involvement in the selection of the department chairman.
2. Concurrently, there must be opportunity for the dean to appoint a chairman with whom he can develop a sound working relationship. The chairman must be satisfactory to both the faculty and the administration.
3. There should be a term of office or a periodic review for the chairman, with the provision of reappointment. Both the faculty and the dean must be included in this procedure.

4. Students majoring in the department should be involved in the selection of the department chairman, although the extent of the involvement would vary. In the selection of the chairman, the basic concerns are those of the faculty and the administration, but the student viewpoint should be represented.

5. An atmosphere of mutual trust and honesty based on good communications is an essential element in all human relations and particularly at all levels of university administration.

I would totally agree with Dr. Mobley in four of his five points. However, his principle number 3, I have some reservations. That is, "there should be a term of office .... with the provision for reappointment." Firstly, the idea that the detailed selection of a department chairman is to be only temporary, two to five years, is the surest way to defeat of the position. Secondly, the idea that your first-line supervisor is under the constant threat of termination, rotation, or whatever else, only serves to diminish the importance of the position, and to insure his ultimate downfall. There was a time, and some still practice it I am sure, when this was a possible, but not desirable, method of selection. Thirdly, a look at the intricacies of a good chairman's duties and responsibilities should be enough to convince any "doubting Thomas" that, when properly performed, the chairman's position is one of the most demanding in the institution. Two years is hardly an adequate period of time to develop an effective department or a chairman, even under the expert guidance of a "perfect" dean and department chairman. Fourthly, constant review and evaluation of all personnel is an absolute managerial necessity. However, this should never be viewed from the standpoint of getting rid of someone; but, rather as a sincere effort to improve each and every person to the peak of their potential. Should a person not be able to measure up to the demands of the position, for whatever good and sound

legitimate reasons there may be, and sufficient time has passed, and every reasonable effort has been made to produce the quality desired, then replacement must be made. Fifthly, continuity of position, as mentioned by Mobley, is a necessity of modern departmental operations -----as is faculty participation; and, in the larger departments, even an assistant for the chairman. The diversity of modern society requires almost daily evaluation of programs. This is particularly true in the comprehensive community colleges, and the even more aggressive proprietary schools. Therefore, the selection of an aggressive and understanding leader for continuity of position must seriously be considered as a prime prerequisite for appointment.

Other selection criteria which are overlooked or only casually reviewed include a detailed investigation of the historical performance of persons seeking a new position, detailed evaluation of personal and personnel records, history of involvement in committee and professional organizations, attitudes exhibited during job and committee preformance, review of the applicants publications, if applicable, applicants credit rating and general ability to handle financial resources, human behavioral qualities, managerial effectiveness, his overall track record, and specific interviews with persons at least recommending the candidate and those in positions once or twice removed from his immediate sphere of operations. Students can often times be very helpful, as well as support staff and maintenance personnel. State traffic records can reveal very essential information not otherwise available. Community service organizations may elicit very favorable responses and assist greatly. Last, but not least, detailed interviews must be made by many and varied personnel

from different levels of the institution to seek their respective attitudes and insights about the candidate. Some administrators, I'm sure, may feel these added selection criteria to be excessive or even ludicrous. However, the demanding responsibilities of the position when properly performed, the large funds managed by some chairman, exceeding a million dollars, supervision of significant numbers of professional and nonprofessional staff, the ability to get along with all personnel, and many other supervisory performance requirements all point to the need for very careful selection of any department chairman.

Finally, a compilation period should be undertaken to evaluate all available information about each candidate and to reduce the number of applicants to from three to five. These three to five applicant's records are submitted to the dean with the committee's recommendations as well as reasons for not selecting candidates. The dean then has the opportunity to select his personal choice, which may or may not include the persons recommended by the committee. If the dean selects a person other than one recommended by the committee, which is rarely the case, immediate review must be made by the dean and the committee to come to some agreement. At this time, the dean should make known his reasons for rejection, if this be the case.

It is important to point out again that these criteria and procedures are only those most often overlooked or infrequently used. Many of the more common criteria must be added to this list to formulate an overall selection policy for department chairman. Obviously, the methods, criteria, and procedures will vary with each institution and position, but most of the sug-

gestions presented here will go a long way to delineating qualified applicants for the position. The key to the administration of most management problems starts with careful selection of key personnel.

While the selection of key personnel is a very important concern and phase of institutional operations, selection cannot be made until the particular job or position has a definite job description and a concise description of the duties to be performed. It is very important, therefore, to formulate a definite role within which the chairman can effectively operate. The next section is devoted to assisting in defining the role of our middle manager.

Middle Management Role Definition

Research studies have shown that the role of the department chairman as perceived by the faculty, administration, and the chairman varies considerably (31, 41, 42). This ambiguity is fostered by both faculty and administration either knowingly or unknowingly. The faculty, who seek an "instructor-type" leader (one who allies with them) feel that an undefined position of leadership will give a much broader interpretation of the chairman's duties and thus the availability of an increased degree of authority and responsibility. As one faculty member (a full professor) in a leading Rocky Mountain university said in an open faculty meeting, "We get only as much power as we take away from the administration." Further, they feel that the more ambiguous the position definition, the more difficult it is to be "pinned down" to the responsibilities of the position. Some Chairman, I'm sure, concur in this observation. On the other hand, the chairman's boss or supervisor (usually the dean or a director) can view the lack of a

definitive chairman's description as a God-send-----duties and responsibilities he doesn't have to commit to writing can easily be demanded from his subordinate whenever the occasion arises, and the chairman has little recourse but to satisfy the dean's "requests". The dubious mutual satisfaction derived from this loose, undefined type of organizational arrangement has little to recommend it; and, in fact, appears to be the basis for the failures shown by many of those assuming the position in the past. It is little wonder that research shows considerable role ambiguity, when those responsible for defining the role of the department chairman (predominantly the faculty, chairman and dean) either refuse to clarify it, don't know how to, or refuse to assist others who wish to. This thus appears to be a very clever ruse (really not very clever) to keep the chairman in a lower monetary position of impotence and fence-jumping-----not being fully recognized as an administrator, a faculty member, or as a matter of fact, anything at all. When, in reality, it is probably the single most important position in all of higher education.

It is my contention and that of many others, that the most critical and needed position within middle management of post secondary education is the position of department chairman or its equivalent (12, 22). J. Barry McGannon, S.J. (p. 27), Dean of Arts and Science at St. Louis University put it this way:

> There is among academic administrators what I can only characterize as universal agreement that the most important single person in the academic world is the departmental chairman. -----the department head is the stimulus and goad to dean and faculty alike. He is the pace-setter, the curriculum maker. He is the tone-setter for the relations of the faculty with the administrators, for relations with other faculty, for relations with

> students. He is the lifeline of the college or university-----. It is they who have in their hands the power to make an institution great.

These statements can be fully appreciated only when viewed in the light of what the department chairman does, his duties, the responsibilities he assumes or is delegated, and the authority he is given. In other words, his role.

Duties and Responsibilities of Our Middle Manager

Years ago when student enrollment was low, departments were small, and budgets reflected equal stature, the duties of most department chairman were considered to be insignificant, housekeeping chores. These chores required little, if any, imagination or intelligence, and were hardly time-consuming or challenging. In fact, they were given or accepted primarily as a friendly gesture for meritorious service, in a few cases for ability, and in most cases for some reason other than supervisory qualities.

During the past year I have had the opportunity to put together a list of some of the duties performed by department chairman. This list, TABLE I, reflects, 1) my experience as a faculty member and recipient of the chairman's supervision at the high school, community college, and university levels; 2) experience at the assistant to the dean level working very closely with department chairman; and 3) information derived from a review of the literature. The combination of these successive experiences has given me the opportunity to view the many facets of the department chairman's position as it exists from the secondary level through the university level. I feel, therefore, that passing on a compilation of infor-

mation may prove beneficial to others. Others who may supervise department chairman, may be supervised by department chairman, or those who are deaprtment chairman. Concurrently, it should also clarify his role within the institution, with the faculty, and with the senior administrators. Further, the information should reduce the degree of role ambiguity and conflict now presently associated with the position of department chairman or its equivalent.

TABLE I is a list of duties performed by, assigned or attributed to the department chairman. They are grouped under six major functions or activities. These are: managerially oriented, clerically oriented, faculty oriented, student oriented, maintenance or support personnel oriented, and curriculum oriented. The list contains 113 separate items of which almost 50 per cent are in the management oriented category, 20 per cent in the faculty oriented category and about 10 per cent in the curriculum oriented category. The remaining three categories contain 20 per cent of the total, almost half of which is clerically oriented. The duties listed in TABLE I are self explanatory and need no elaboration except to say that the time to perform each varies with each duty and its relative importance. However, the point to be made is that the chairman's duties are many and varied, and need to be put into writing as well as placed into proper perspective. Doing these two simple tasks should reduce role conflict, assess the nature of his position more carefully, and assure that there is adequate time to perform his many and varied duties. Obviously, these duties will vary somewhat from department to department and from college to college; but, in my experience, most of these duties are performed by most department chairman at the college-university level, if not the secondary level. The idea that a

TABLE I

A MAJOR, GROUPED LIST OF OVER 100 DUTIES PERFORMED BY, ASSIGNED OR ATTRIBUTED TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

Managerially Oriented

1. Organize and plan department meetings.
2. Establish goals of the department.
3. Assign department duties.
4. Assign rooms and space.
5. Approve requests.
6. Evaluate department progress.
7. Maintain professional standards.
8. Coordinate departments.
9. Plan new facilities.
10. Maintain class size.
11. Develop departmental policies and procedures.
12. Planning.
13. Maintain public relations.
14. Coordinate department visits.
15. Schedule classes.
16. Solve logistical problems.
17. Assist in the development of Institutional policies and procedures.
18. Attend intra-departmental meetings.
19. Attend committee meetings.
20. Assists in the development of the calendar.
21. Continually exhibits himself as a good leader.
22. Assists the upper echelon administration.
23. Prepares the department budget.
24. Allocates resources.
25. Continuously apprises departmental needs.
26. Prepares supervisory bulletins.
27. Writes correspondence.
28. Directs departments research activities.
29. Serves on the administrative council.
30. Participates in community services projects.
31. Approves supply requisitions.
32. Seeks more funds.
33. Prepares reports.
34. Prepares long-range department forecasts.
35. Assesses educational trends and their effect on the department.
36. Constantly reviews the departments statistical base and the implications.
37. Prepares job descriptions.
38. Adept at handling faculty.
39. Continuously upgrades himself.
40. Assists in preparation of management information systems.
41. Coordinates evening college program.
42. Coordinates off-campus programs.
43. Gives lectures and leads discussions.
44. Revises catalog.
45. Attends advisory committee meetings.
46. Serves as a resource person.
47. Joins and participates in Professional organizations.
48. Writes articles for publication.
49. Performs research.
50. Assists in other managerial functions.

Faculty Oriented

1. Assigns faculty loads.
2. Assigns student teachers.
3. Orients new faculty.
4. Solve faculty problems.
5. Award tenure & leave.
6. Dismiss faculty.
7. Assigns faculty schedule.
8. Supervises full and part-time faculty.
9. Reviews faculty salary.
10. Stimulates faculty self improvement.
11. Interviews applicants.

TABLE I CONTINUED

Faculty Oriented Continued

12. Coordinates department staff meetings.
13. Teaches
14. Evaluates faculty.
15. Visits classrooms.
16. Develops in-service training programs.
17. Resolves faculty-administration disputes.
18. Interprets administrative policy to the faculty.
19. Improves instructional techniques.
20. Assigns faculty to committees.
21. Has informal discussions with faculty.
22. Assists in other faculty functions.

Curriculum Oriented

1. Develops curriculum.
2. Implements curriculum.
3. Selects text books.
4. Establishes course prerequisites.
5. Articulates with high school and university.
6. Improves classroom instruction.
7. Formulates transfer manual.
8. Assesses course additions and deletions.
9. Coordinates curriculum with other units of the college.
10. Prepares course outlines and objectives.
11. Prepares federally-funded program documents.
12. Coordinates occupational oriented curriculum with external college entities.
13. Assists in other curriculum functions.

Clerically Oriented

1. Requisitions supplies and equipment.
2. Requests travel funds.
3. Receives supplies and equipment.
4. Receives departmental mail.
5. Does reproduction work.
6. Typing.
7. Maintains department inventories.
8. Prepares department brochures.
9. Answers the phone.
10. Files and file maintenance.
11. Assists in other clerical functions.

Student Oriented

1. Student placement.
2. Student advising.
3. Mediating student-faculty problems.
4. Constantly reviews registration within the department.
5. Prepares "Test-out" exams.
6. Assists in student activities.
7. Coordinates student activities with department.
8. Assists in student counseling.
9. Assesses student grading.
10. Assists in other student-oriented functions.

Maintenance or Support Personnel Oriented

1. Hires staff for department.
2. Evaluates needed repairs.
3. Coordinates library operations with department.
4. Coordinates personnel section with department.
5. Supervises support personnel.
6. Evaluates staff personnel.
7. Assists in other maintenance or support staff functions.

first or front-line administrator who performs most of these functions can teach one quarter or more of the year is, without question, robbing Peter to pay Paul; and, a very careful examination should be made of the senior administrator allowing this practice to take place. Earl Bolton (14), Vice President of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Educational Management Consultants, said:

> Universities are unable to respond to the need for change because they are under managed----- with too few management positions and too few managers.

Mr. Bolton goes on to say that what few management positions there are, are inadequately filled, the president has too much of a work load, there is insufficient depth in management, academic officers are over worked with few supporting personnel, new management positions at all levels should be considered, and efforts must be made to attract management personnel from all sources. Beck and Rosenberger (10, p. 49) put it this way:

> Almost all----------school administrative structures are severely understaffed. ---------- No military or industrial executive would dream of accepting the span of control regularly assigned the----------school administrator.

Probably the single most important reason for under management at the college level is the lack of trained administrators who could visualize the need for more and better managers. The second reason, however, is the failure of management to recognize the significance and importance of the position of their first-line supervisor, the department chairman. It is my "feeling", based mostly on experience, that almost all major management problems in higher education can be traced to these two reasons, which

affect primarily, the extremes of the entire management structure. If both ends of the administrative hierarchy function smoothly, then almost all areas in between function smoothly. However, if either experiences serious difficulty or conflict, usually the intermediate management structure also feels the strain.

Not only are duties overloading the chairman, when he is performing them properly, but his authority and responsibility, all too often neglected in writing in his job description, impinge tremendously on his duties, his faculty, and the general demanding atmosphere surrounding him. This conflict is referred to by Dressel (3, p. 82):

> It is not that department chairman are always constrained by the university systems in which they work (although this is often the case), but rather that the staggering amount of routine activities required and the diverse expectations of the dean on the one hand and the faculty on the other greatly limit the chairman's authority and deprive him of satisfaction in his work.

Frank E. Ross (40. pp. 896 & 900) had dual but opposing punches:

> One teacher said recently, "I've often wanted to drown my troubles, but I can't get my department head near the pool" ----- Department chairman should be provided with an analyzing couch, blood pressure pills, a new set of dentures, ear plugs, and a Spiro Agnew watch to get him to three meetings held simultaneously.

APPENDIX "A", at the end of this report, lists some 34 responsibilities of division chairman at Golden West College in Southern California. While this list is not exhaustive, and it is primarily for the community college, it is fairly typical. What isn't typical, however, with most institutions is the inclusion of all chairman's responsibilities and duties in a comprehensive job description.

Specific duties, responsibilities, and span of authority should be committed to writing to avoid the never-ending tangle of role ambiguity and conflict. Many in higher education have recommended written procedures, duties and responsibilities. A. B. Smith (41, p. 42) in his article, "Department Chairman: Neither Fish Nor Fowl," recommended the development of sound procedures and job descriptions; J. P. O'Grady, Jr. (31, p. 36) wrote that there must be definitions for the areas of responsibility for the dean and the chairman; H. B. Pierce's (38, p. 29) article, "A Look at the Science Division Head," which surveyed 536 accredited junior colleges, showed that 21 per cent of the science division heads needed more authority commensurate with their responsibilities in major administrative areas; Koehnline and Blocker (22, p. 10) indicated that administration must be defined, the organization of operating divisions described, and the role of the division chairman described; Dressel and Faricy (2, p. 12) in their book, "Return to Responsibility", put it this way:

> This book contains conclusions based on our belief that imposition of role definitions and come operational controls on universities will not seriously interfere with their autonomy and that such controls have little to do with academic freedom.

The [illegible] of the discussion in this section is that detailed job descrip[illegible] are an absolute necessity. The role conflict and ambiguity current[illegible]sociated with, particularly, the middle management, department chair[illegible]n position is unnecessary because of the plethora of information avail[illegible] is imperative, therefore, that each job have a definite description of authority, duties, and responsibilities; and, if this has not been accomplished in certain institutions the material contained herein, if nothing else, can at least be a point of departure.

Middle Management Training

In addition to the need for administration understanding, appropriate middle management selection, and the dire need for middle management role definition, there is almost overwhelming necessity for middle management training. H. B. Pierce (38, p. 31) recommended in-service training in administration and human psychology. David Booth (14) in his paper, "The Training of New Department Chairman," given at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education insists that there must be continuing in-service training for the chairman and the dean, (I would add that the training should be for all supervisory personnel). Lucio and McNeil (24, pp. 49 & 58) in their book, Selection and Preparation of Supervisors, said:

> No individual left to his own devices is likely to acquire the wealth of experience essential to effective performance in-----a leadership post.

They recommend in-service training, performance analysis, sensitivity training, internships, and the use of simulation models. Further, they exposed some of the inadequacies in educational management preparation by a quote from the dean of a graduate school, "One-half of what you have learned here is false; unfortunately, we don't know which half." W. J. McKeachie was quoted in Mobley's (30, p. 323) article, ".....department chairman.....are generally ill-prepared, inadequately supported, and more to be pitied than censured. In many departments, the attitude of the faculty toward a colleague who accepts the departmental chairmanship is much like that of nuns toward a sister who moves into a house of prostitution." M. W. Peterson (35, p. 3) indicated in his article, "The Organization of

Departments," that universities must give more concern to department chairman hiring, department structure, and preparation of the chairman.

These are but a few examples which strongly indicate the need and demand for more training of our managers. The question is, what type of training should they receive and when should they receive it. Several sources provide some excellent insight into what is currently new (past two years) in higher education management training.

The Academy for Educational Development (AED) (8, p. 37) has a Higher Education Management Division conducts research and organizes conferences and training programs. The division focuses on how to get more for your money, how to tap new resources, assigning responsibility and authority, organization and structure, roles of trustees, faculty and students, teaching, curriculum and learning problems, personnel policies, long-range planning, budgeting and development, maintenance and security, and management of auxiliary enterprizes.

Another, is the Harvard Business School (8, p. 68) which has a program for educational management. Topics presented by the school include managing the educational institution, planning and control, management information systems (MIS), human relations, and organizational problems.

Several organizations have provided MIS's for educational institutions. Some of the more widely known are: The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (NCHEMS at WICHE), Boulder, Colorado; Midwest Research Institute (MRI),

Kansas City, Missouri; College and University Systems Exchange (CAUSE), Boulder, Colorado; General Electric, Corporate Research and Development (CRD), Schenectady, New York; and Systems Research Group, Inc. (SRG) of Toronto, New York, and Washington, D.C., innovators of CAMPUS, Comprehensive Analytical Methods for Planning in University/College Systems. Programs in Labor Relations sponsored by the University of Michigan; Management By Objectives at William Rainey Harper College in Pallatine, Illinois, and many others too numerous to mention all serve to point out the availability of abundant educational offerings for the managers in higher education. The above offerings coupled with educational management courses given at almost all private and public universities in almost every state in the union, indicates the availability of training for our educational middle managers. This is not to say that the higher education community has not responded to these needs. Many hundreds have; particularly under the necessary and watchful eye of a prodding legislature, combined with a shortage of funds. What the education community has not done, however, is to have sufficient long-range planning to anticipate and correct their problems before someone else does it for them. Perhaps the future will change this picture once appropriate management has been functioning for a reasonable length of time in the educational community.

The question of "when" training should be taken has a simple and relevant answer-----<u>no later than now</u>.

Colleges and universities offering administrative or management degrees in education must revise them to the point where not more than about 40 per cent of the courses taken for a masters or doctors degree should be taken

in the field of education; and, those should probably be taken as part of an intern program or on-the-job-training in the field of the students major interest. Further, the 40 per cent requirement could be reduced 5 per cent for each year of appropriate experience offered. A person with 10 years experience in his field may take no course work in education or perhaps only a few seminars. His program would be multi-discipline oriented, and directed by the college of education in close cooperation with all other appropriate university departments. Few courses need be taken in the classroom, i.e., the university without walls, television via satellites, extension courses, on-campus visitations, independent study, and many other methods could be used. The remainder of the students course work could be taken in the fields of business, organizational development, organizational behavior, data processing, principles of management, management information systems, planning and budgeting, organizational theory and practice, labor relations, programmed instruction, and personnel work. If the senior institutions cannot accomplish these goals, then for the sake of the community colleges, they must. I. R. Kiernan (19, p. 22) said it succinctly:

> We should not count on the four-year colleges and universities to train (personnel) for two-year colleges, especially when experiences show that the universities tend to do this in isolation from the realities of two-year college needs and circumstances.

Bill Moore, Jr. (5, p. 105) quoted a Chicago community college teacher:

> There isn't much use of spending a lot of time in arguing about which one is worse (the community college or the university) when it comes to poor folks, they are both hogs at the same trough. The university has just been there longer.

Moore makes these recommendations:

> .....have colleges or universities hire local community college administrators as their professors in the field and to use the community college as a laboratory and extension of the university and graduate school. ..... A well developed residency should be instituted in graduate programs so that the student can spend time assigned to at least two community colleges.....an inner city or urban campus,..... (and) .....a suburban one serving middle class students. .....One can observe.....that on-the-job-training is one of the most effective ways to train an administrator. .....Another way a community college may expose the administrative staff to innovation is through an exchange program. Each administrator in the participating group would choose to work at a school different in size, location, enrollment, racial composition, governance, philosophy, financing pattern, and so forth. The receiving institution would have the chance to try a new approach for a period of time, and the administrator would have a new experience.

These methods of internships, on-the-job-training, exchanges of professors and administrators, more business, management, human relations, data processing courses, the use of simulation models, and the close cooperation of all members of the education community should produce abundant and promising results in a very short period of time. Much has already been done in some institutions, in some areas. Frank Ross (40, p. 901) put it this way:

> We must stop revisiting these recommendations and start implementing them. Let us have a strong, vital committed, intelligent, trained, active, (understanding), chairman with the authority and means to direct and lead his relevant department.

SUMMARY

From the foregoing it can be seen that adequate educational opportunities are available for any willing and/or receptive administration to insure the necessary attitudes toward, selection of, role definition for, and training of his department level middle managers. All that remains to be done is to do it.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1, p. 130) made the following comments:

> Perhaps the most promising approach to more effective management in higher education.....is the training and development of a middle level administrative staff.....

Furthermore, since middle management positions would be for long service career positions the:

> .....colleges and universities could expect to benefit from substantial investment in appropriate training for such staff members. .....(they) could assume many of the day to day functions.....thereby; (1) reducing the amount of released faculty time required for administration; (2) providing more efficient and consistent administrative policies and practice; and (3) providing experiences and informed professional assistance to faculty members assuming new administrative responsibilities. There should likewise be emphasis on providing specialized training for non-academic administrators. The Commission also recommends that the president of the institution be given adequate assistance from a highly capable staff.

While these comments were directed more to the larger institution, and to personnel other than just the chairman and dean, they fit precisely the prerequisites for the department chairman in the smaller colleges,

and what may well prove to be his equivalent in larger colleges and universities, if such recommendations are implemented.

I understand, as do many, that the current understaffing at the administrative level, and the undermanaging at all levels of higher education make the task of improving management more formidable. As Bill Moore, Jr. put it:

> When one is up to his ass in alligators, it is easy to forget that his original objective was to drain the swamp.

APPENDIX "A"

GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE

Division Chairman Responsibilities

☆ Responsibilities for which reliable secretarial assistance is needed

➪ Responsibilities which demand greater time and attention than they can presently receive from division chairman if GWC is to be innovative or to remain effective

Administrative structure at GWC includes 5 deans in student personnel and one dean of instruction. Division chairmen are in effect assistants to the dean of instruction. The division center concept at GWC defines the role of the division chairman as a pivotal one in matters affecting personnel, instruction, curriculum, advisement, budget, and campus communication including administration/faculty exchange and the development of policies and procedures.

It is the consensus of all division chairmen that their present duties are highly desirable ones and that even more responsibility ought to be assumed by chairmen than they now have time to assume (e.g., registration and class enrollment). The chairmen believe that the division center should indeed be the focus of campus activities, and that increasing administrative responsibilities should therefore be supported by released time and/or permanent, efficient secretarial assistance.

Division chairman responsibilities fall into 8 categories:

1. TEACHING

☆ Under district policy, each division chairman is required to teach a 4/5 load, regardless of the number of staff within his division, and without respect to his assignment to permanent college committees.

2. COMMITTEES AND MEETINGS

   a. President's Cabinet: All division chairmen are permanent members. Since all other committees submit recommendations to the PC, the Cabinet is the major clearing-house and policy-making group on the campus. If the division center concept is to be supported, if division chairmen are indeed representatives of the faculty in policy matters, and if division chairmen are to carry information between administration and faculty, it would seem essential that they remain members of the PC. The Cabinet meets twice monthly for a minimum of 2 hours.

   b. Council on Curriculum and Instruction: All division chairmen are permanent members. They hold primary responsibility for the development and continuing evaluation of curricula, as well as for

supervision and evaluation of instruction. Since curricula must be developed on an inter-divisional basis, it is important that each division chairman be continually aware of curriculum needs and problems in other divisions; the occasional presentation of single courses in isolation from other divisions creates potential problems for graduation and transfer requirements, major curricula, counseling, and inter-divisional coordination. If division chairmen are to accomplish more than the building of empires, each chairman must work closely with other division chairmen and with the dean of instruction in the interest of the total college program. The CCI meets weekly for two hours.

c. Division meetings: If the division center is to be operative and to involve participation of faculty, regular division meetings are a must.

d. Ad hoc committees: Since division chairmen are generally knowledgeable faculty members with understanding of total college and district policies and procedures, they are often selected by district offices, the PC, or the Faculty Senate to serve temporarily on ad hoc committees. Division chairmen should not be excluded from assuming such leadership when they can contribute effectively to college affairs.

3. ADVISEMENT

a. Division counselor: Under the division center concept, division chairmen are expected to work closely with counseling and guidance personnel through direct counseling, and faculty advisement depends upon effective communication with the division counselor.

b. Advisees: Division chairmen have also undertaken to advise a limited number of students who are assigned to them personally.

c. Re-assignment of advisees: Division chairmen assume primary responsibility for re-assignment of advisees to faculty within the division. In addition, chairmen maintain a close record of each instructor's advisee load and of student requests for advisor change. The effectiveness of faculty advisement may be measured in part by such close supervision by division chairmen.

d. Advisee spill-over: Division chairmen often advise those students who occasionally have difficulty contacting their advisors. In the event of instructor absence or student/instructor scheduling problems, the division chairman assumes responsibility for advisement.

PERSONNEL AND INSTRUCTION

a. Personnel

(1) Recruitment: Division chairmen, as they should be, are actively involved and invariably consulted in the recruitment of teaching personnel, including the review of the papers of all candidates and personal conference with many.

(2) Supervision and evaluation: Division chairmen and assistant division chairmen have primary responsibility for supervision and evaluation of all instructors. Classroom visits, at least two written evaluations, and individual conferences are required for all teaching personnel. If new instructors are to be given sufficient assistance and in-service training at the division level, division chairmen should be expected to visit classes and/or confer with each instructor more often than once or twice anually. A minimum of 3-4 hours is required for each formal instructor contact; if a chairman is responsible for 8-12 probationary instructors in a given year, much more of his time than is now available should be given to assisting those instructors.

(3) Supervision of classified personnel: Division chairmen are responsible for selecting and supervising lab assistants and classified personnel within the division.

(4) Substitutes and instructor absences: Division chairmen are responsible for reporting and recording all instructor absences and for staffing such classes when substitutes are assigned within the division.

b. Instruction

(1) Curriculum development: Division chairmen receive and/or initiate all curricular changes within the division in conjunction with the division counselor. While individual faculty are inevitably involved in the development of courses and/or curricular patterns, the leadership in curriculum development belongs, as it should, to the division chairman.

(2) Schedule: Division chairmen and assistants have almost sole responsibility for designing each semester's schedule. The chairman must consider such diverse factors as student scheduling problems (and coordination with other divisions' schedules), instructor qualifications and preferences, work load, facilities, and sequence and geography of hours and rooms. A workable and equitable scheduling of teachers and hours and courses requires hours of preparation by the division chairman. In addition, he must provide copies of individual instructor schedules to all instructors as well as to the dean of instruction.

(3) Divisional research: The effectiveness of curricular patterns derives from continued awareness of student performance, particularly in remedial or sequential course patterns. Furthermore, if innovation is to be any more than intuitive "experiment", the collection and evaluation of data is essential. If the division chairman cannot assume leadership for such research, it will not occur.

(4) Project development: Projects which qualify for federal funds are normally suggested and often completed by division chairmen. Faculty involvement is desirable but not always possible nor actual.

(5) Text selections: All text selections must be approved by the division chairman. All forms cross his desk and all coordination with the bookstore and the dean of instruction is accomplished through the chairman.

(6) Course outlines: Course outlines should be regularly evaluated. The division chairman has responsibility for keeping course outlines up-to-date and for providing copies to new instructors.

(7) Catalog revisions: Generally a reflection of CCI action, catalog revisions are nevertheless an essential responsibility of division chairmen each year. All proposed changes must be discussed with the division and with the division counselor.

(8) Evening college coordination: Division chairmen are periodically called upon by the evening college dean for recommendations re. staff, parallel course offerings, texts and other matters of coordination which may not go through CCI. Evening assistant division chairman assume some responsibility for supervision and coordination, but day division chairmen are often necessarily involved and should be much more involved than they presently can be if evening college programs are to be supportive of day programs and truly parallel in content.

(9) Annual written report: Chairmen must submit annual reports to the superintendent's office summarizing the activities of the division.

5. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

a. Brochures and other printed materials: Primary responsibility for developing and writing information despersed to the community belongs to the division chairman who must assume leadership in such matters.

b. Advisory committees: Several division chairmen are regularly involved with citizens' committees in the development of curricula and courses of study. All division chairmen attend the college citizens' advisory committee meetings.

c. Articulation with high schools: If GWC is to serve the local students effectively, cooperative efforts with the high schools are necessary. Contacts at the instructional level have been welcomed and/or requested by local high school staff.

d. Articulation with OCC: Concerted effort should be made between both campuses for coordination of courses and curricula.

e. Telephone requests: Division chairmen, as sub-administrators, are beseiged by phone calls from faculty, students, administrators, and citizens. Without secretarial assistance, calls are often uncompleted, or if completed, create constant interruption, almost harrassment, of division chairmen.

6. CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

While faculty willingly assume responsibility for division councils in GWC student government, division chairmen need to assume leadership in student activities and to support by their attendance college affairs and productions. Special events (e.g., the Fine Arts Festival) require division chairman planning and leadership.

7. CAMPUS COMMUNICATION

Division chairmen are the key dispensers of communication among faculty. They receive weekly requests to disperse minutes of the 3 college councils (PT, CCI, CAC), and to consult with and/or inform their faculty in response to requests from students, Faculty Association, Faculty Senate, district offices, and a variety of ad hoc committees.

8. BUDGET

a. Annual budget: Division chairmen must prepare annual budgets for divisions.

b. Purchasing: Division chairmen must initiate and/or approve all purchase orders and return all invoices. They are solely responsible for purchase of equipment.

c. IMC: Division chairmen receive monthly statements from IMC; in addition, they must approve all extraordinary requests from faculty for IMC services.

d. Maintenance of physical plant: Division chairmen are continually requested to assume responsibility for expediting repairs to buildings, offices, and classrooms, and to anticipate needs for modification of existing facilities or to plan new facilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "The More Effective Use of Resources", An Imperative for Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, June 1972, 201 pages.

2. Paul L. Dressel and William H. Faricy, "Return to Responsibility", Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, 1972, 232 pages.

3. Paul L. Dressel, F. Craig Johnson and Philip M. Marcus, "The Confidence Crisis", Jossey-Bass inc., Publishers, San Francisco, 1970, 268 pages.

4. William B. Eddy, W. Warner Burke, Vladimir A. Dupre, and Oron South, editors, "Behavioral Science and the Manager's Role", NTL Learning Resources Corporation, University of California, Los Angeles, October, 1971, 320 pages.

5. William Moore, Jr., "Blind Man on a Freeway", Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, 1971, 173 pages.

6. Edgar H. Schein, Richard S. Lazarus, Editor, "Organizational Psychology", Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 2nd edition, 1970, 138 pages.

7. George R. Terry, "Principles of Management", Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, sixth edition, 1972, 703 pages.

PERIODICALS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

8. Academy for Educational Development (AED), "Here's Help for Perplexed Managers", AED's new Higher Education Management Division, College and University Business, Vol. 50, January 1971, pp. 37 and 68.

9. S. K. Bailey, "Public Money and the Integrity of the Higher Academy", Educational Record, Vol. 50, No. 2, 1969, pp. 149-154.

10. W. R. Beck and David S. Rosenberger, "The Chairman: Where Does He Fit In", The Clearing House, Vol. 46, September 1971, pp. 48-51.

11. Wilmar F. Bernthal, "Organizational Leadership: Some Conceptual Models", Paper presented at the Mountain-Plains Institute for New Presidents of Community Colleges, Scottsdale, Arizona, May 5, 1969, ERIC No. ED 034530.

12. Paul R. Bingamen, "Consider Department Chairman", Pennsylvania School Journal, Vol. 118, September 1969, pp. 67-84.

13. Peter Blomerly, "The Junior College Department and Academic Governance", Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, February 1971, pp. 38-40.

14. Earl C. Bolton and F. H. Genck, "Universities and Management", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, April 1971, pp. 279-291.

15. David Booth, "The Training of New Department Chairman", WICHE, March 4, 1969, 12 pages, ERIC No. ED 028711.

16. Paul L. Dressel, F. Craig Johnson and Philip M. Marcus, "Departmental Operations: The Confidence Game", Educational Record, Vol. 50, Summer 1969, pp. 274-278.

17. Paul L. Dressel and D. J. Reichard, "University Department: Retrospect and Prospect", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 41, May 1970, pp. 387-402.

18. Harold L. Hodgkinson, "Who Decides Who Decides", Current Issues In Higher Education, Vol. 24, 1969, pp. 139-144.

19. I. R. Kiernan, The New Style In College Administration", Junior College Journal, Vol. 38, 1967, pp. 22-23.

20. Loren E. Klaus, "The Committee is to Blame", College Management, Vol. 5, December 1970, p. 28.

21. Richard L. Knudson, "Help Stamp Out Department Chairman", English, Journal, Vol. 60, March 1971, pp. 377-378.

22. William A. Koehnline and Clyde E. Blocker, "The Division Chairman In the Community College", Junior College Journal, Vol. 40, February 1970, pp. 9-12.

23. John Lombardi, "Prospects for Middle Management", Community College Supplement to Change Magazine, Vol. 4, No. 8, October 1972, pp. 32a-32d.

24. William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, "Selection and Preparation of Supervisors", from "Supervision: A synthesis of Thought and Action", McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 2nd Edition, Chapter 3, 1969, 34 pages.

25. Joseph A. Malik, "Decision-Making In the Community Colleges", Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, Vol. 12, No. 3, November 1968, 15 pages, ERIC No. ED 026056.

26. Wilbert J. McKeachie, "Memo to New Department Chairman", Educational Record, Spring 1968, p. 221.

27. J. Barry McGannon, S. J., "Relationship of the Departmental Chairman to the Academic Dean", Higher Education Executive Association, St. Louis University, November 11, 1968, 7 pages, ERIC No. ED 026963.

PERIODICALS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS, CONTINUED

28. Melvin Merzon, "Help Stamp Out Department Chairman", A discussion of R. L. Knudson's article, English Journal, Vol. 60, September 1971, pp. 806-807.

29. Michael P. Metty, "The Departmental Chairman and the Public Institution or It's a Bird, It's a Plane, No It's a .....", American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 4, 1969, 7 pages, ERIC No. ED 028715.

30. Tony A. Mobley, "Selecting the Department Chairman", Educational Record, Vol. 52, Fall 1971, pp. 321-327.

31. James P. O'Grady, Jr. "The Role of the Department Chairman", Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, February 1971, pp. 32-36.

32. Gerald R. Oncken, "Organizational Control in University Departments", U. S. Office of Education-Bureau of Research, No. 0-0340, University of Illinois, June 1971, 51 pages, ERIC No. ED 057758.

33. Ernst G. Palola, "The Reluctant Planner: Faculty in Institutional Planning", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, October 1971, pp. 587-602.

34. Anthony Papalia, "The Department Head: "A Survey of Duties and Responsibilities", State University of New York, Buffalo, New York, 1970, 4 pages, ERIC No. ED 042389.

35. Marvin W. Peterson, "The Potential Impact of PPBS on Colleges and Universities", Journal of Higher Education, Research Report No. 2, December 1970, 4 pages, ERIC No. ED 053682.

36. Marvin W. Peterson, "The Potential Impact of PPBS on Colleges and Universities", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, January 1971, pp. 1-20.

37. Allen O. Pfnister, "The Role of Faculty in University Governance", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 41, June 1970, pp. 430-449.

38. Harmon B. Pierce, "A Look at the Science Division Head", Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, November 1971, pp. 28-31.

39. Arliss L. Roaden, "The College Deanship: A new Middle Management In Higher Education", Theory In Practice, Vol. 9, October 1970, pp. 272-276.

40. Frank E. Ross, "Escape from Mediocrity: "Making English Departments Work", English Journal, Vol. 60, October 1971, pp. 896-901.

41. Albert B. Smith, "Department Chairman: Neither Fish Nor Fowl", Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, March 1972, pp. 40-43.

PERIODICALS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS, CONTINUED

42. J. H. Upton, "Role Conflict and Faculty Confidence in Leadership", Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, February 1971, pp. 28-31.

43. James W. Verchota, "The Department Chairman: Manager or Specialist", The High School Journal, Vol. 55, December 1971, pp. 128-132.

44. Lloyd S. Woodburne, "Principles of College and University Administration", Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1958, p. 77.

45. R. D. Yeo, "Departmentalization: Solution or Problem", Educational Forum, Vol. 35, November 1970, pp. 39-44.

46. Marvin H. Young, "Processes and Structures for Decision-Making In the Science Division of Selected Public Junior Colleges In Florida", Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 18 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION